

Changing optical band structure with single photons

Andreas Albrecht,¹ Tommaso Caneva,¹ and Darrick E Chang¹

¹*ICFO-Institut de Ciències Fotòniques, The Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology, 08860 Castelldefels (Barcelona), Spain.*

Achieving strong interactions between individual photons enables a wide variety of exciting possibilities in quantum information science and many-body physics. Cold atoms interfaced with nanophotonic structures has emerged as a platform to realize novel forms of nonlinear interactions. In particular, when atoms are coupled to a photonic crystal waveguide (PCW), long-range atomic interactions can arise that are mediated by localized atom-photon bound states. We theoretically show that in such a system, the absorption of a single photon can change the band structure for a subsequent photon. This occurs because the first photon affects the atoms in the chain in an alternating fashion, thus leading to an effective period doubling of the system and a new optical band structure for the composite atom-nanophotonic system. We demonstrate how this mechanism can be engineered to realize a single-photon switch, where the first incoming photon switches the system from being highly transmissive to highly reflective, and analyze how signatures can be observed via non-classical correlations of the outgoing photon field.

Creating strong, controllable interactions between individual photons enables many opportunities [1] ranging from quantum information processing to the creation of strongly correlated quantum states of light [2–6]. Atoms form ideal nonlinear photonic elements to accomplish these tasks, and therefore have been used in diverse settings as cavity QED [7–9] or Rydberg atomic gases [10–12]. A promising new approach is the field of waveguide QED [13, 14], made possible by experiments to interface atoms with propagating modes of nanophotonic systems including nanofibers [15] and photonic crystal waveguides (PCWs) [16–19]. While these platforms were originally developed to improve upon figures of merit compared to their macroscopic counterparts, more interestingly they enable unprecedented possibilities for engineering interactions with no obvious prior analogue [20, 21].

Here, we identify and analyze a remarkable example, where a single propagating photon effectively changes the photonic band structure for a second photon. This effect relies on the fact that a near-resonant photon is efficiently converted into an atomic excitation, and that atomic excitations can be made to interact strongly and coherently by aligning the atomic transition frequency with band gaps of an underlying PCW [21–23]. Specifically, an excited atom hybridizes with a localized photon to form an atom-photon bound state, the photonic component of which can couple to proximal atoms [21, 24, 25]. This mechanism has been validated experimentally only recently for atoms along PCWs [24] and transmon qubits [25]. While the effect of spatially smooth interactions on the propagation of photons has been analyzed before [26, 27], we here exploit that for an atomic lattice trapped with the PCW periodicity, atom-atom interactions naturally alternate in sign. Thus, the presence of one atomic excitation effectively creates a doubling of the atomic periodicity from the standpoint of a second propagating photon, resulting in a dramatic change of its dispersion relation.

We focus specifically on a regime in which a periodicity doubling (Fig. 1(a)) leads to a so-called atomic-

mirror configuration [28–30]. This creates a situation in which the absorption of a single photon makes the medium highly reflecting for a subsequent one. We show that this effect can be observed with weak classical input states, in the form of anti-bunching in the transmitted field. Subsequently, we analyze the performance of this system as a single-photon switch, in which a single-photon wavepacket is first mapped into the system to regulate the propagation of subsequent photons.

Dynamic atomic mirror configuration – We consider an array of N atoms trapped along a PCW with the photonic crystal periodicity a (Fig. 1(a)). We assume that the $|g\rangle$ to $|e\rangle$ transition of an atomic three-level system, with frequency ω_{eg} , couples to a guided mode of given polarization (e.g., transverse magnetic (TM), Fig. 1(b),(c)). In line with experiments, we assume a single atom can emit into the waveguide at a rate Γ_{1D} significant in magnitude compared to its free-space rate Γ' [16, 17]. We probe the g-e transition by a (weak coherent) input field $\mathcal{E}_{\text{in}}$ through the waveguide, whose propagation can be described in a recently developed spin-model description [28, 31]. In that framework the atomic dynamics are governed by the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_{\text{TM}} = \mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}_{\text{wg}}$. Here, $\mathcal{H}_0$ describes the input field $\mathcal{E}_{\text{in}}$ detuned by frequency δ from atomic resonance and the atomic free space decay. It takes the form

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = -i\frac{\Gamma'}{2} \sum_m \sigma_{\text{ee}}^m - \sum_m \left[\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{\text{in}}(t) e^{ikz_m} e^{-i\delta t} \sigma_{\text{eg}}^m + \text{h.c.} \right], \quad (1)$$

with $z_m = ma$ the position of atom m and the atomic operators defined as $\sigma_{ij} = |i\rangle\langle j|$. The spin Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_{\text{wg}} = -i\frac{\Gamma_{1D}}{2} \sum_{m,n} e^{ik|z_m - z_n|} \sigma_{\text{eg}}^m \sigma_{\text{ge}}^n$ accounts for the coupling of the atoms via the emission and re-absorption of photons in the TM mode. Once the atomic dynamics are determined from evolution under $\mathcal{H}_{\text{TM}}$, the right (+)- and left (-)-going field can be recovered using the input-output relations [28, 31] $\mathcal{E}_{\pm}(z, t) = \mathcal{E}_{\text{in}}^{\pm}(z, t) + i\frac{\Gamma_{1D}}{2} \sum_{z_m} \sigma_{\text{ge}}^m e^{\pm ik(z - z_m)}$, which relate the outgoing field in terms of the atomic coherences and input fields $\mathcal{E}_{\text{in}}^{\pm}$




FIG. 1. (a) Array of atoms along a PCW, trapped with the structure period a . Lower: An excitation (single photon absorption, yellow atom) induces strong, long-range and alternating atom-atom interactions $\mathcal{J}$ mediated by a photonic bound state within the PCW band gap (yellow). In certain regimes, this interaction effectively produces an alternating shift of the atomic transition frequency ω from its bare value ω_0 as indicated by the vertical scale. (b) Schematic band structure of the TE and TM mode. The horizontal dashed line marks the atomic transition frequencies, here without loss of generality drawn equal. (c) Atomic three-level structure and couplings (see main text for definitions).

(here $\mathcal{E}_{\text{in}}^+(z, t) \equiv \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{\text{in}}(t)e^{i(kz - \delta t)}$, while $\mathcal{E}_{\text{in}}^-(z, t) = 0$).

A second transition involving metastable state $|s\rangle$ and $|e\rangle$ is assumed to have a different polarization, and couples to the transverse electric (TE) mode of the waveguide. The transition frequency ω_{es} is assumed to lie within a TE band gap (see Fig. 1(b)). Thus, $|e\rangle$ cannot spontaneously emit into the band due to the absence of resonant modes. Instead, the photon that the atom attempts to emit is exponentially confined to a length L around the atomic position [21, 22]. This photon can be coherently exchanged with proximal atoms, leading to a long-range interaction of the form [21, 24]

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{bg}} = \mathcal{J} \sum_{m \neq n} \cos(q z_m) \cos(q z_n) e^{-|z_m - z_n|/L} \sigma_{\text{es}}^m \sigma_{\text{se}}^n. \quad (2)$$

Here, the cos-terms account for the standing-wave nature of the field at frequencies within a band gap [17], in direct analogy to a Fabry-Perot cavity. Within the TE band gap the wavevector $q = \pi/a$, such that $\cos(q z_m) \cos(q z_n) = (-1)^{(m+n)}$ and the interaction is intrinsically of alternating sign. Whereas previous proposals neglected that sign alternation [26, 27, 31], it forms the crucial mechanism

for creating non-linear photon interactions in our setup. We moreover assume that the longitudinal spatial extent is tuned to be nearly constant [21], such that $\exp(-|z_m - z_n|/L) \simeq 1$. In addition we introduce a control field Ω on the band gap (s-e) transition that allows for modifying the atom-atom interaction character. It can be described by $\mathcal{H}_c = \delta_c \sum_m \sigma_{ss}^m - \Omega \sum_m [\sigma_{es}^m + \text{h.c.}]$ with δ_c the control field detuning from the s-e resonance. Thus the total Hamiltonian is $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{TM}} + \mathcal{H}_c + \mathcal{H}_{\text{bg}}$, which combined with the input-output operators allows for solving the probe field propagation dynamics.

We assume that the atoms are initialized in state $|g\rangle$, and we restrict the analysis to two excitations in the $\{|e\rangle, |s\rangle\}$ manifold. This corresponds to weak input states in the TM mode where the probability of more than two photons being absorbed is negligible. Spin-flip interactions (2) require at least one excitation in each of the states $|e\rangle$ and $|s\rangle$. Since all atoms are initialized in $|g\rangle$, a single photon propagating in the TM mode remains unaffected by the band gap interaction. To understand two-photon propagation, we examine the atomic two-excitation spectrum. In the regime $|\delta_c| \gtrsim |\Omega|, |\mathcal{J}|$, the states $|e\rangle$ and $|s\rangle$ are not effectively mixed together. The states $|e_m e_n\rangle$ and $|s_m s_n\rangle$ therefore remain eigenstates within lowest-order perturbation theory, but experience an energy shift due to quantum fluctuations to states $(|s_m e_n\rangle + |e_m s_n\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. Due to $\mathcal{H}_{\text{bg}}$ the energy difference between these two states is not just δ_c , but shifted additionally by $\mathcal{J}_{mn} = (-1)^{m+n} \mathcal{J}$. This results in an (ac-Stark) energy shift that in perturbation theory can be calculated as (see Appendix A) $\Delta\omega_{ee} = -2\Omega^2/(\delta_c + \mathcal{J}_{mn})$ and $\Delta\omega_{ss} = 2\Omega^2/(\delta_c - \mathcal{J}_{mn})$ for $|e_m e_n\rangle$ and $|s_m s_n\rangle$, respectively.

Consequently, two-excitation energy levels pick up an alternation due to the underlying Bloch modes. The transition energies can thus be divided into two sublattices of double periodicity (Fig. 1(a)), separated in energy by $\Delta\nu \simeq 4\Omega^2 \mathcal{J}/(\delta_c^2 - \mathcal{J}^2)$. We now discuss how this manifests itself in photon propagation. Suppose a first photon is initially sent into the medium. The photon has a high chance of creating an atomic excitation in $|e\rangle$ ($|s\rangle$), if its frequency is close to single-photon (two-photon) resonance $\delta \sim 0$ ($\Delta \equiv (\delta - \delta_c) \sim 0$). The propagation of a second photon through the medium is then governed by the frequencies of the doubly excited states $|e_m e_n\rangle$ ('e-branch') or $|s_m s_n\rangle$ ('s-branch'). The second photon thus sees a new band structure associated with this atomic "refractive index" pattern of doubled periodicity. In particular, if the splitting is resolved $\Delta\nu > \Gamma'$, the second photon would effectively either see a highly transparent medium if its frequency is similar to the bare atomic transition (as all resonances have been shifted), or see only every other atom if its frequency is aligned with one of the sublattice transitions.

Even though that concept is quite general, we here choose $ka = \pi/2$, in which case the period-doubled configuration $k(2a) = \pi$ is known to result in a dramatically different photon propagation. Whereas $ka = \pi/2$ rep-

resents a configuration that minimizes reflection [26, 31], $ka = \pi$ corresponds to the atomic-mirror configuration of constructive reflection [28–30]. In particular, for an array of $N/2$ two-level atoms (i.e. states g and e evolving under $\mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}_{\text{wg}}$) with this spacing, the reflectance spectrum is characterized by a Lorentzian [28]

$$\mathcal{R}(\Gamma_{1D}, \Gamma', \delta) = \frac{[(N/2)\Gamma_{1D}]^2}{[(N/2)\Gamma_{1D} + \Gamma']^2 + (2\delta)^2}. \quad (3)$$

Here the reflectance $\mathcal{R}$ is defined as the ratio of reflected to input intensity. For $\Gamma' \ll (N/2)\Gamma_{1D}$, the resonance width scales like $\Delta\omega = (N/2)\Gamma_{1D}$. This property arises from the superradiant collective response of the atoms [28], and is in fact independent of the filling fraction of trapped atoms. Thus, our choice of lattice constant $ka = \pi/2$ enables the resulting physics to be observed without the need for unity filling of sites. The reflectance spectrum is shown in Fig. 2 (a) for $N/2$ atoms with spacing $ka = \pi$, and differs significantly from the case of N atoms spaced at $ka = \pi/2$. Later, we will show that for the two-photon transition involving $|s\rangle$, Eq. (3) holds but with re-scaled decay rates Γ_{1D} , Γ' .

Photon and excitation correlations – We now consider the effects of the change in band structure on a weak coherent state input. Here and in the following we resonantly excite atoms to the ‘s-branch’ by choosing a two-photon detuning $\Delta \sim 0$, and define $\delta = \delta_{\text{res}}^{(1)}$ as the probe detuning where linear transmission is maximally attenuated. Signatures of nonlinearities are observable in two-photon correlations of the cw-probe field $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{\text{in}}(t) = \mathcal{E}_0$; in particular we illustrate in Fig. 2 (b) $g^{(2)}(0) = \langle \mathcal{E}_+^\dagger \mathcal{E}_+^\dagger \mathcal{E}_+ \mathcal{E}_+ \rangle / \langle \mathcal{E}_+^\dagger \mathcal{E}_+ \rangle^2$ of the transmitted probe field (see Appendix E for details of the calculation). We find two branches of photon antibunching $g^{(2)}(0) < 1$, which are increasingly shifted away from the point of maximum linear attenuation $\delta = \delta_{\text{res}}^{(1)}$ with increasing atomic coupling $\mathcal{J}$. The positions of the branches, which indicate a suppression of two-photon propagation, qualitatively follow the conditions for high reflectance of a second photon when a single atomic excitation is first prepared deterministically (white lines, calculated in detail later), however with a reduced splitting. In the present case of a weak coherent state input, the spatio-temporal dynamics of multi-photon propagation appear quite complicated, and we cannot find a simple predictive model for the anti-bunching dips. However, we believe that the positions of the anti-bunching dips represent a balance between efficient absorption of the first photon (maximal near $\delta_{\text{res}}^{(1)}$), and decreased reflectance away from the resonances of a single sublattice (white lines). While it might be difficult to observe experimentally, numerically we can find additional confirmation of the physics by examining the atomic populations. Specifically, near one of the anti-bunching dips (black arrow of Fig. 2 (b)), a checkerboard pattern in the population of states $|s_m s_n\rangle$ (Fig. 2 (c)) reveals that indeed only atoms of a single sublattice are excited. For the opposite anti-bunching branch a complementary (inverted) pattern holds.




FIG. 2. (a) Reflectance (red) and transmittance (blue) for an input field detuning δ from a two-level transition and $\Gamma_{1D} = \Gamma'$. Solid lines correspond to $N = 100$, $ka = \pi/2$, dashed lines to a sublattice of every second atom $N = 50$, $ka = \pi$. (b) Two-photon correlation $g^{(2)}(0)$ for the transmitted field vs relative field detuning $\delta - \delta_{\text{res}}^{(1)}$ ($\delta_{\text{res}}^{(1)} = 97.62\Gamma'$) and atomic coupling rate $\mathcal{J}$. The overset illustrates the linear transmittance spectrum $\mathcal{T}^{(1)} = \langle \mathcal{E}^\dagger \mathcal{E} \rangle / \mathcal{E}_0^2$. White lines border the region of high reflectance ($\mathcal{R} > 0.8$) for the case where an s-excitation is prepared deterministically. The numerical parameters used are $N = 100$, $\Gamma_{1D} = 0.5$, $\Gamma' = 1$, $\delta_c = 94$, $\Omega = 18.8$, $\mathcal{E}_0 = 10^{-4}$. (c) Wave-function population (arbitrary units) of the doubly excited states $|s_m s_n\rangle$ at the position marked by the black arrow ($\delta - \delta_{\text{res}}^{(1)} = 1.38\Gamma'$, $\mathcal{J} = 25\Gamma'$) in (b).

plementary (inverted) pattern holds.

Conditional single photon reflection – We now consider the case where a “gate” photon is initially and deterministically mapped onto a spin excitation, whose presence or absence controls the propagation of a subsequent “signal” photon. Such a case is interesting because it removes the spatio-temporal complexity associated with a coherent state input, and also constitutes a logical quantum gate. The signal photon will be centered at a frequency corresponding to one of the sublattice resonances, which leads to strong reflection in the presence of the gate. We will also be primarily interested in the regime where the sublattice resonances are well-separated $\Delta\nu > (N/2)\Gamma_{1D}$. This implies that the signal photon is far off resonance from the atomic medium absent the gate and is thus nearly perfectly transmitted in that case.

The gate photon can be mapped onto a spin excitation $|s\rangle$ using, e.g., electromagnetically induced trans-




FIG. 3. (a) Atomic population decay in time for an initial ‘dark’ excitation in $|s\rangle$, an atom number $N = 100$, and for different ratios of waveguide Γ_{1D} to free-space Γ' decay. The e - and s -populations are defined as the total populations $p_e^{\text{tot}} = \sum_{n=1}^N \langle \sigma_{ee}^{(n)} \rangle$ and $p_s^{\text{tot}} = \sum_{n=1}^N \langle \sigma_{ss}^{(n)} \rangle$, respectively. (b) Conditional reflectance $\mathcal{R}$ (red, squares) and transmittance $\mathcal{T}$ (blue, circles) spectra for the s -branch in the presence of a non-decaying gate excitation and $N\Gamma_{1D}/\Gamma' = 100$. Green and light green lines (triangles) correspond to the transmittance and reflectance in the absence of an initial gate excitation, respectively. Data points represent numerical results, solid lines the transfer-matrix model predictions. Parameters: $\delta_c = 470\Gamma'$, $\Omega = 94\Gamma'$, $\mathcal{J} = 235\Gamma'$.

parency (EIT). It results in a spin wave excitation $|\psi\rangle \sim \sum_j e^{ik_{\text{EIT}} z_j} f_j |s_j\rangle$ with an error $\sim \Gamma'/(N\Gamma_{1D})$ [26, 32, 33]. Here $k_{\text{EIT}} = \pi/(2a)$ is the wavevector corresponding to the EIT transparency window, f_j is a slowly-varying envelope that depends on the details of the initial pulse shape, and $|s_j\rangle \equiv \sigma_{sg}^j |g\rangle^{\otimes N}$. Once the gate photon is mapped in, directly applying the control field Ω would cause the spin-wave to propagate and be mapped out into a photon. To ‘‘trap’’ this excitation inside the atomic gas, and allow an efficient interaction with the signal photon, one can first apply a spatially varying phase (e.g. by a magnetic field gradient) to shift the central wavevector, $k_{\text{EIT}} \rightarrow 2k_{\text{EIT}}$. With the appropriate amplitude shape, the resulting state can be made ‘dark’ to the waveguide, such that it represents an eigenstate of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{wg}}$ with minimal decay rate (for more details see Appendix B).

The decay of such an initial ‘dark’ excitation is shown in Fig. 3(a) for different ratios of Γ_{1D}/Γ' . One generally observes that the decay of an excitation within the chain, apart from the initial time period, is essentially independent of the waveguide decay rate and given by $\Gamma_{\text{dec}} \simeq \rho_e \Gamma'$, where $\rho_e \simeq (\Omega/\delta_c)^2$ is the amount of population in $|e\rangle$ that mixes with $|s\rangle$ due to the control field. This behavior arises from the collective nature of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{wg}}$, which splits the single excitation manifold into a few states that radiate efficiently into the waveguide and a vast number of subradiant ones (see Appendix B). The effective decay rate into the waveguide for these ‘dark’ configurations scales as $\Gamma_{\text{wg}} \propto \Gamma_{1D} N^{-3}$ with the atom number.

Having established the fidelity for the gate photon to be mapped into a spin excitation and its lifetime, we now consider its effect on a signal photon. In order to separate the finite decay rate of the spin excitation arising

from the gate photon from the propagation dynamics of the signal, we first consider a system where one atom is initialized in $|s\rangle$, and whose decay rates $\Gamma_{1D} = \Gamma' = 0$ are set to zero. Thus it only sees the rest of the atomic chain through the band gap coupling. The response to the signal field is then calculated by considering the system response to a weak cw-input field $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{\text{in}}(t) = \mathcal{E}_0$. This results in a reflectance spectrum as shown by the data points in Fig. 3(b). The results also show good agreement with a simpler effectively linear optical model (solid lines), described in detail in Appendix C. Here the reflection and transmission coefficients of individual atoms are alternated by hand, and the reflectance and transmittance of the entire array is obtained by a transfer matrix calculation.

In the limit $\Delta\nu > (N/2)\Gamma_{1D}$, the (s -branch) spectrum consists of two resonances ($\pm$) of Lorentzian shape. These resonances can be approximated by $\mathcal{R}(\Gamma_{1D}^{\text{eff}}, \Gamma_{\text{eff}}', \delta_{\pm})$ (3). Here $\Gamma_{1D}^{\text{eff}} = \epsilon_{\pm} \Gamma_{1D}$ and $\Gamma_{\text{eff}}' = \epsilon_{\pm} \Gamma'$ are the effective waveguide and free space decay rates of the transition, respectively, and $\delta_{\pm}$ the resonance detuning. $\epsilon_{\pm}$ characterizes the amount of e -population mixed into s in the two-excitation manifold, and in the dispersive limit $(\Omega/\delta_c \ll 1, \mathcal{J}/\delta_c \lesssim 1)$ follow as $\epsilon_{\pm} \simeq (\Omega/(\delta_c \pm \mathcal{J}))^2$ (see Appendix A). A detrimental effect, associated with the off-resonant interactions between the optical field and the far-detuned atomic sublattice, appears in the peak reflectance as interference dips




FIG. 4. (color online) (a) Signal pulse reflectance $\mathcal{R}_{\text{pulse}}$ vs $N\Gamma_{1D}/\Gamma'$ for an initial gate excitation prepared at $t=0$ and a signal pulse $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{\text{in}}(t) = \mathcal{E}_0 \sin^2(\pi/2(t/t_0))$ for $0 \leq t \leq 2t_0$. The temporal pulse width t_0 has been optimized, with the optimized values shown in (b). The red triangles and red circles correspond to the signal pulse resonant with the right (broader) s -branch resonance of Fig. 3(b) with phase adjustment parameter $\kappa = 9\text{e-}4$ and $\kappa = 0$, respectively. Green triangles account for the signal pulse resonant with the left (narrower) s -branch resonance ($\kappa = 0$). (c) Reflected I_r (red) and transmitted I_t (blue) signal pulse intensity (normalized by $|\mathcal{E}_0|^2$) for $N\Gamma_{1D}/\Gamma' = 100$ ($N=200$, $\Gamma_{1D}=1/2\Gamma'$, $\mathcal{E}_0 = 2\text{e-}4\Gamma'$) on the right (broader) s -branch resonance with optimal pulse width $t_0 = 2.95\Gamma'^{-1}$. Solid and dashed lines correspond to the presence and absence of a gate excitation, respectively.

(inset of Fig. 3(b)). These dips become more prominent for larger optical depth $\mathcal{D} = 2N\Gamma_{1D}/\Gamma'$ and decreasing frequency difference between the sublattice resonances. Aside from increasing the latter, they can also be suppressed by modifying the propagation phase of the bare waveguide $ka = \pi(1 + \kappa)/2$ as explained in more detail in Appendix D 1.

Having analyzed the gate excitation lifetime and the excitation-dependent reflectance properties independently, we now consider the full dynamics of a signal pulse interacting with a (decaying) initial gate excitation. In order to exploit the reflectance properties, the pulse time t_0 must be small compared to the gate excitation lifetime, and its bandwidth $\propto 1/t_0$ small compared to the reflectance resonance linewidth: $\Gamma_{\text{dec}} < t_0^{-1} < \Delta\omega_{\text{res}}$. We illustrate the optimal signal pulse reflectance $\mathcal{R}_{\text{pulse}}$ and its scaling with $N\Gamma_{1D}/\Gamma'$ in Fig. 4(a), obtained for the numerically optimized pulse time t_0^{opt} depicted in Fig. 4(b). Here we assume the s-branch configuration as in Fig. 3(b) with an initial (and decaying) gate excitation prepared at $t = 0$, followed by the launch of a signal pulse of shape $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{\text{in}}(t) = \mathcal{E}_0 \sin^2(\pi/2(t/t_0))$ ($0 \leq t \leq 2t_0$, $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{\text{in}}(t) = 0$ otherwise). The reflectance $\mathcal{R}_{\text{pulse}}$ is defined as the ratio of time-integrated reflected output to input intensity, where the background field leaked by the decaying excitation has been subtracted. As expected a larger ratio $\Delta\omega_{\text{res}}/\Gamma_{\text{dec}}$ improves the reflectance. Thus, centering the gate pulse around the right (broader) resonance

of Fig. 3(b), yields a higher reflectance as compared to the left (narrower) resonance. In Fig. 4(a), one also sees the effect of the interference dips. In particular, without compensating for them, the reflectance (red circles) saturates around 77%. In contrast, no saturation emerges in the compensated (propagation phase adjusted) version, reaching 83% reflection for $N\Gamma_{1D}/\Gamma' = 200$ ($\mathcal{D} = 400$). An example for the probe pulse propagation is illustrated in Fig. 4(c), comparing the propagation in the presence and absence of an initial excitation. A clear inversion from dominant reflection in the former to transmission in the latter case can be observed.

In summary, we have proposed a system, in which a single excitation (‘gate photon’) controls the propagation of a subsequent photon by effectively modifying the topology of atoms along a PCW. We have shown how this can be observed both in two-photon correlations and in the reflectance of a probe pulse. While we have only considered the limit of infinite-range interactions ($L \rightarrow \infty$) here, it would be interesting in the future to explore finite-range interactions, where a photon only changes the topology of its immediate surroundings. It would also be interesting to consider analogous effects in higher dimension [34].

The authors thank H.J. Kimble and J.S. Douglas for useful discussions. The work was supported by the ERC Starting Grant FOQAL, the MINECO Plan Nacional Grant CANS, the Severo Ochoa Grant SEV-2015-0522, and the Fundacio Privada Cellex.

-
- [1] D. E. Chang, V. Vuletić, and M. D. Lukin, “Quantum nonlinear optics - photon by photon,” *Nature Phot.* **8**, 685–694 (2014).
 - [2] M. J. Hartmann, F. G. Brandao, and M. B. Plenio, “Strongly interacting polaritons in coupled arrays of cavities,” *Nature Phys.* **2**, 849–855 (2006).
 - [3] A. D. Greentree, C. Tahan, J. H. Cole, and L. C. Hollenberg, “Quantum phase transitions of light,” *Nature Phys.* **2**, 856–861 (2006).
 - [4] D. E. Chang, V. Gritsev, G. Morigi, V. Vuletić, M. D. Lukin, and E. A. Demler, “Crystallization of strongly interacting photons in a nonlinear optical fibre,” *Nature Phys.* **4**, 884–889 (2008).
 - [5] D. G. Angelakis, M. F. Santos, and S. Bose, “Photon-blockade-induced Mott transitions and XY spin models in coupled cavity arrays,” *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 031805 (2007).
 - [6] C. Noh and D. G. Angelakis, “Quantum simulations and many-body physics with light,” *arXiv:1604.04433* (2016).
 - [7] Q. A. Turchette, C. J. Hood, W. Lange, H. Mabuchi, and H. J. Kimble, “Measurement of conditional phase shifts for quantum logic,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 4710 (1995).
 - [8] H. J. Kimble, “The quantum internet,” *Nature* **453**, 1023–1030 (2008).
 - [9] A. Reiserer and G. Rempe, “Cavity-based quantum networks with single atoms and optical photons,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **87**, 1379 (2015).
 - [10] J. D. Pritchard, D. Maxwell, A. Gauguier, K. J. Weatherill, M. P. A. Jones, and C. S. Adams, “Cooperative atom-light interaction in a blockaded Rydberg ensemble,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 193603 (2010).
 - [11] T. Peyronel, O. Firstenberg, Q.-Y. Liang, S. Hofferberth, A. V. Gorshkov, T. Pohl, M. D. Lukin, and V. Vuletić, “Quantum nonlinear optics with single photons enabled by strongly interacting atoms,” *Nature* **488**, 57–60 (2012).
 - [12] J. D. Pritchard, K. J. Weatherill, and C. S. Adams, “Nonlinear optics using cold Rydberg atoms,” in *Annual Review of Cold Atoms and Molecules*, Vol. 1 (World Scientific Publishing Co, 2013) pp. 301–350.
 - [13] D. E. Chang, A. S. Sørensen, E. A. Demler, and M. D. Lukin, “A single-photon transistor using nanoscale surface plasmons,” *Nature Phys.* **3**, 807–812 (2007).
 - [14] A. F. van Looy, A. Fedorov, K. Lalumière, B. C. Sanders, A. Blais, and A. Wallraff, “Photon-mediated interactions between distant artificial atoms,” *Science* **342**, 1494–1496 (2013).
 - [15] E. Vetsch, D. Reitz, G. Sagué, R. Schmidt, S. T. Dawkins, and A. Rauschenbeutel, “Optical interface created by laser-cooled atoms trapped in the evanescent field surrounding an optical nanofiber,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 203603 (2010).
 - [16] A. Goban, C.-L. Hung, S.-P. Yu, J. D. Hood, J. A. Muniz, J. H. Lee, M. J. Martin, A. C. McClung, K. S. Choi, D. E. Chang, O. Painter, and H. J. Kimble, “Atom-

- light interactions in photonic crystals,” *Nat. Commun.* **5**, 3808 (2014).
- [17] A. Goban, C.-L. Hung, J. D. Hood, S.-P. Yu, J. A. Muniz, O. Painter, and H. J. Kimble, “Superradiance for atoms trapped along a photonic crystal waveguide,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 063601 (2015).
 - [18] A. Javadi, I. Söllner, M. Arcari, S. L. Hansen, L. Midolo, S. Mahmoodian, G. Kiršanskė, T. Pregolato, E. H. Lee, J. D. Song, S. Stobbe, and P. Lodahl, “Single-photon non-linear optics with a quantum dot in a waveguide,” *Nature Comm.* **6**, 8655 (2015).
 - [19] P. Lodahl, S. Mahmoodian, and S. Stobbe, “Interfacing single photons and single quantum dots with photonic nanostructures,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **87**, 347 (2015).
 - [20] J. Petersen, J. Volz, and A. Rauschenbeutel, “Chiral nanophotonic waveguide interface based on spin-orbit interaction of light,” *Science* **346**, 67–71 (2014).
 - [21] J. S. Douglas, H. Habibian, C.-L. Hung, A. V. Gorshkov, H. J. Kimble, and D. E. Chang, “Quantum many-body models with cold atoms coupled to photonic crystals,” *Nature Photon.* **9**, 326–331 (2015).
 - [22] S. John and J. Wang, “Quantum electrodynamics near a photonic band gap: Photon bound states and dressed atoms,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64**, 2418 (1990).
 - [23] G. Kurizki, “Two-atom resonant radiative coupling in photonic band structures,” *Phys. Rev. A* **42**, 2915 (1990).
 - [24] J. D. Hood, A. Goban, A. Asenjo-Garcia, M. Lu, S.-P. Yu, D. E. Chang, and H. J. Kimble, “Atom-atom interactions around the band edge of a photonic crystal waveguide,” *PNAS* **113**, 10507–10512 (2016).
 - [25] Y. Liu and A. A. Houck, “Quantum electrodynamics near a photonic bandgap,” *Nature Phys. advance online publication*, – (2016).
 - [26] J. S. Douglas, T. Caneva, and D. E. Chang, “Photon molecules in atomic gases trapped near photonic crystal waveguides,” *Phys. Rev. X* **6**, 031017 (2016).
 - [27] E. Shahmoon, P. Grišins, H. P. Stimming, I. Mazets, and G. Kurizki, “Highly nonlocal optical nonlinearities in atoms trapped near a waveguide,” *Optica* **3**, 725–733 (2016).
 - [28] D. E. Chang, L. Jiang, A. V. Gorshkov, and H. J. Kimble, “Cavity QED with atomic mirrors,” *New J. Phys.* **14**, 063003 (2012).
 - [29] N. V. Corzo, B. Gouraud, A. Chandra, A. Goban, A. S. Sheremet, D. V. Kupriyanov, and J. Laurat, “Large Bragg reflection from one-dimensional chains of trapped atoms near a nanoscale waveguide,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 133603 (2016).
 - [30] H. L. Sørensen, J.-B. Béguin, K. W. Kluge, I. Iakoupov, A. S. Sørensen, J. H. Müller, E. S. Polzik, and J. Appel, “Coherent backscattering of light off one-dimensional atomic strings,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 133604 (2016).
 - [31] T. Caneva, M. T. Manzoni, T. Shi, J. S. Douglas, J. I. Cirac, and D. E. Chang, “Quantum dynamics of propagating photons with strong interactions: a generalized input-output formalism,” *New J. Phys.* **17**, 113001 (2015).
 - [32] M. Fleischhauer, A. Imamoglu, and J. P. Marangos, “Electromagnetically induced transparency: Optics in coherent media,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **77**, 633 (2005).
 - [33] A. V. Gorshkov, A. André, M. Fleischhauer, A. S. Sørensen, and M. D. Lukin, “Universal approach to optimal photon storage in atomic media,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 123601 (2007).
 - [34] A. González-Tudela, C.-L. Hung, D. E. Chang, J. I. Cirac, and H. J. Kimble, “Subwavelength vacuum lattices and atom-atom interactions in two-dimensional photonic crystals,” *Nature Phot.* **9**, 320–325 (2015).
 - [35] C. Cohen-Tannoudji, J. Dupont-Roc, and G. Grynberg, *Atom-Photon Interactions* (Wiley-VCH, 2004).
 - [36] I. H. Deutsch, R. J. C. Spreeuw, S. L. Rolston, and W. D. Phillips, “Photonic band gaps in optical lattices,” *Phys. Rev. A* **52**, 1394 (1995).
 - [37] D. E. Chang, A. H. Safavi-Naeini, M. Hafezi, and O. Painter, “Slowing and stopping light using an optomechanical crystal array,” *New J. Phys.* **13**, 023003 (2011).

Appendix A: Effective Hamiltonian, resonance positions and effective decay rates




FIG. 5. (a) Energy levels and control field couplings and detunings in the two-excitation manifold. The band gap coupling $\mathcal{J}_{mn} = \mathcal{J}(-1)^{m+n}$ leads to a splitting of its eigenstates $|\pm\rangle_{mn} = 1/\sqrt{2}(|e\rangle_{mn} \pm |s\rangle_{mn})$, resulting in an effective control field detuning $\delta_{\text{eff}}^{\pm} = \delta_c \pm \mathcal{J}_{mn}$ between the transitions from states $|ee\rangle_{mn}$ and $|ss\rangle_{mn}$. (b) Frequency separation for the *e*- (upper) and *s*-branch (lower) in the rotating frame, indicating the frequency with respect to the probe field detuning δ . The alternating band gap coupling $\pm\mathcal{J}$ leads to two branches for the single to double excitation transition (ii). To resonantly drive the transitions in the absence (i) and presence (ii) of an initial ‘gate’ excitation, the detunings must be set to the indicated transition frequencies.

In the main text, we argued that the combination of band gap interactions ($\mathcal{H}_{\text{bg}}$) and off-resonant driving ($\mathcal{H}_c$) leads to an effective energy shift of two-excitation states $|e_m e_n\rangle$ and $|s_m s_n\rangle$. These state energies determine the frequencies of the reflectance resonances as seen by a probe field. We derive and explain these results in greater detail here.

Let us first rewrite the total Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$ in the form $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}' + \mathcal{H}_{\text{es}}$, where

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{es}} = \mathcal{H}_c + \mathcal{H}_{\text{bg}} = \delta_c \sum_m \sigma_{ss}^m - \Omega \sum_m [\sigma_{es}^m + \text{h.c.}] + \sum_{m \neq n} \mathcal{J}_{mn} \sigma_{es}^m \sigma_{se}^n \quad (\text{A1})$$

captures the effect of control field $\mathcal{H}_c$ and atom-atom coupling $\mathcal{H}_{\text{bg}}$. Here Ω and δ_c denote the control field Rabi frequency and detuning, respectively. The coupling constant $\mathcal{J}_{mn} = (-1)^{(m+n)}\mathcal{J}$ reflects the alternating nature of the band gap interaction. The contribution $\mathcal{H}'$ accounts for the remaining contributions in the spin-model description, that is

$$\mathcal{H}' = \mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}_{\text{wg}} = -i\frac{\Gamma'}{2} \sum_m \sigma_{ee}^m - \sum_m \left[\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{\text{in}}(t) e^{ikz_m} e^{-i\delta t} \sigma_{eg}^m + \text{h.c.} \right] + \mathcal{H}_{\text{wg}} \quad (\text{A2})$$

with the probe field $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{\text{in}}(t)$ and detuning δ , the free space emission rate Γ' , and the effective waveguide coupling Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_{\text{wg}}$ as defined in the main text.

We now analyze the effective form of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{es}}$ in the limit of large control field detunings and in the framework of quasi-degenerate perturbation theory [35].

In the *single excitation manifold*, the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_{\text{es}}$ takes the simple form

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{es}}^{(1)} = \delta_c \sum_m |s\rangle_m \langle s| - \Omega \sum_m |e\rangle_m \langle s| + \text{h.c.} \quad (\text{A3})$$

where $|j\rangle_m$ denotes the state with atom m excited to state j and all other atoms in the ground state $|g\rangle$. In the limit $|\Omega| \ll |\delta_c|$ and to second order in Ω/δ_c it takes the effective form

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{es}}^{(1)} \simeq \left(-\frac{\Omega^2}{\delta_c} \right) \sum_m |\tilde{e}\rangle_m \langle \tilde{e}| + \left(\delta_c + \frac{\Omega^2}{\delta_c} \right) \sum_m |\tilde{s}\rangle_m \langle \tilde{s}| \quad (\text{A4})$$

with the dressed states defined as ($\epsilon = \Omega/\delta_c$)

$$|\tilde{e}\rangle = |e\rangle - \epsilon |s\rangle, \quad |\tilde{s}\rangle = |s\rangle + \epsilon |e\rangle. \quad (\text{A5})$$

Eq. (A4) thus describes the conventional (single-atom) ac Stark shift, where a far detuned laser shifts the energies of the states involved in the transition by an amount $\pm\Omega^2/\delta_c$.

In the *two-excitation manifold*, the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_{\text{es}}$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{\text{es}}^{(2)} = & 2\delta_c \sum_{(mn)} |ss\rangle_{mn} \langle ss| + \sum_{(mn)} (\delta_c + \mathcal{J}_{mn}) |+\rangle_{mn} \langle +| + (\delta_c - \mathcal{J}_{mn}) |-\rangle_{mn} \langle -| \\ & - \sqrt{2}\Omega \sum_{(mn)} (|ee\rangle_{mn} \langle +| + |ss\rangle_{mn} \langle +| + \text{h.c.}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A6})$$

where the sum accounts for all possible two-excitation pair combinations and the eigenstates of the atom-atom coupling contribution have been defined as

$$|\pm\rangle_{mn} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|es\rangle_{mn} \pm |se\rangle_{mn}). \quad (\text{A7})$$

The form of Hamiltonian (A6) reveals that, as a consequence of the atom-atom coupling, the control field effectively couples the states $|ss\rangle_{mn}$ and $|ee\rangle_{mn}$ to $|+\rangle_{mn}$ with different detunings $\delta_{\text{eff}}^{\pm} = \delta_c \pm \mathcal{J}_{mn}$ (see Fig. 5(a)). In the limit of $|\delta_c + \mathcal{J}| \gg \Omega$ and $|\delta_c - \mathcal{J}| \gg \Omega$, the Hamiltonian to second order in $\Omega/(\delta_c \pm \mathcal{J}_{mn})$ can effectively be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{\text{es}}^{(2)} \simeq & -\frac{2\Omega^2}{\delta_c + \mathcal{J}_{mn}} |\tilde{e}\tilde{e}\rangle_{mn} \langle \tilde{e}\tilde{e}| + \left(2\delta_c + \frac{2\Omega^2}{\delta_c - \mathcal{J}_{mn}}\right) |\tilde{s}\tilde{s}\rangle_{mn} \langle \tilde{s}\tilde{s}| + (\delta_c - \mathcal{J}_{mn}) |-\rangle_{mn} \langle -| \\ & + \left(\delta_c + \mathcal{J}_{mn} + \frac{4\mathcal{J}_{mn}^2\Omega^2}{\mathcal{J}_{mn}^2 - \delta_c^2}\right) |\tilde{+}\rangle_{mn} \langle \tilde{+}| - \left[\frac{2\Omega^2\mathcal{J}_{mn}}{\mathcal{J}_{mn}^2 - \delta_c^2} |\tilde{e}\tilde{e}\rangle_{mn} \langle \tilde{s}\tilde{s}| + \text{h.c.}\right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A8})$$

with the dressed states

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{e}\tilde{e}\rangle &= |ee\rangle + \sqrt{2}\epsilon_+ |+\rangle \\ |\tilde{+}\rangle &= |+\rangle - \sqrt{2}\epsilon_+ |ee\rangle - \sqrt{2}\epsilon_- |ss\rangle \\ |\tilde{s}\tilde{s}\rangle &= |ss\rangle + \sqrt{2}\epsilon_- |+\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A9})$$

to linear order in $\epsilon_{\pm}$ where $\epsilon_{\pm} = \Omega/(\mathcal{J}_{mn} \pm \delta_c)$.

Note that the transition rate between dressed states, represented by the $|\tilde{e}\tilde{e}\rangle \langle \tilde{s}\tilde{s}|$ term in (A8), is quickly suppressed in the limit $\delta_c \gg \Omega$ and $\mathcal{J} \lesssim \delta_c$ under consideration. The main effect of the control field is then just the energy shift of states $|ee\rangle$ and $|ss\rangle$.

We now analyze the transition energies for the *e*- and *s*-branch. Thereby the *e*-branch is defined as the transitions involving an excitation to $|e\rangle$ and separated in energy close to the atomic g to e transition ($\delta \simeq 0$). Analogously the *s*-branch transitions are defined as the two-photon excitations to $|s\rangle$ and are addressed for detunings near a zero two-photon detuning ($\Delta \equiv \delta - \delta_c \simeq 0$). For the two branches, the corresponding transition frequencies (effective detunings in the rotating Hamiltonian frame) are depicted in Fig. 5(b). The resonances for the probe field in that picture follow by choosing δ equal to the indicated frequencies. For the *e*-branch, and an atom-atom coupling $\pm\mathcal{J}$, this results in $\delta = -\Omega^2/\delta_c$ for the absorption of a single photon from the ground state, which simply represents the level shift arising from the ac-Stark shift induced by the control field. To absorb a second photon in the presence of an atomic excitation in $|e\rangle$ a detuning $\delta = -2\Omega^2/(\delta_c \pm \mathcal{J}) - \Omega^2/\delta_c = -\Omega^2/\delta_c \pm (\Omega/\delta_c)^2(2\mathcal{J}) + \mathcal{O}([\mathcal{J}/\delta_c]^2)$ is required, with the sign dependent on the corresponding atomic sublattice of double periodicity as introduced by the alternating atom-atom coupling $\mathcal{J}_{mn}$. Similarly for the *s*-branch, the single photon resonance follows as $\delta = \delta_c + \frac{\Omega^2}{\delta_c}$, and the resonance for a second excitation as $\delta = \delta_c + 2\Omega^2/(\delta_c \mp \mathcal{J}) - \Omega^2/\delta_c = \delta_c + \Omega^2/\delta_c \pm (\Omega/\delta_c)^2(2\mathcal{J}) + \mathcal{O}([\mathcal{J}/\delta_c]^2)$. Here an additional contribution, the control field detuning δ_c , accounts for the $|g\rangle - |s\rangle$ transition arising from a two-photon process involving the probe and control fields.

The linewidths of the transitions are determined by the effective coupling rates into the waveguide $\Gamma_{\text{1D}}^{\text{eff}}$ and to free space Γ'_{eff} , which follow from multiplying the amount of *e*-population in the corresponding dressed states, eqs. (A5) and (A9), with the bare rates Γ_{1D} and Γ' . For the *e*-branch, and in the dispersive limit considered here, they are in good approximation given by the original rates, i.e. $\Gamma_{\text{1D}}^{\text{eff}} \simeq \Gamma_{\text{1D}}$ and $\Gamma'_{\text{eff}} = \Gamma'$. For the *s*-branch they follow as $\Gamma_{\text{1D}}^{\text{eff}} \simeq (\Omega/\delta_c)^2 \Gamma_{\text{1D}}$, $\Gamma'_{\text{eff}} \simeq (\Omega/\delta_c)^2 \Gamma'$ for the single excitation transition, and $\Gamma_{\text{1D}}^{\text{eff}} \simeq (\Omega/(\delta_c - \mathcal{J}_{mn}))^2 \Gamma_{\text{1D}}$, $\Gamma'_{\text{eff}} \simeq (\Omega/(\delta_c - \mathcal{J}_{mn}))^2 \Gamma'$ for the two-excitation transition.

Despite providing an intuitive qualitative picture, the model presented above is not sufficient to fully describe the transition frequency between the states $|gs\rangle$ and $|ss\rangle$ (see Fig. 5(b)). Whereas the estimate of the resonance frequencies becomes more precise when decreasing the ratios Ω/δ_c and $\Omega/(\delta_c \pm \mathcal{J})$, the linewidths of these resonances

decrease at an even faster rate $\Delta\omega_{\text{res}} \simeq (N/2)\Gamma_{\text{1D}}^{\text{eff}} = (N/2)(\Omega/(\delta_c \pm \mathcal{J}))^2 \Gamma_{\text{1D}}$. Thus we cannot expect our estimated resonance frequency to overlap (within less than the linewidth $\Delta\omega_{\text{res}}$) with the full numerical solution, even though the essential properties are still well-approximated. For the e -branch, the linewidth is to a good approximation constant, i.e. $\Delta\omega_{\text{res}} \simeq (N/2)\Gamma_{\text{1D}}$, and the aforementioned complication does not occur. A more accurate prediction of the resonance frequencies, which also provides excellent quantitative agreement for the s -branch, is given by the transfer-matrix model introduced in Appendix C1.

Appendix B: Subradiant initial excitation decay

We here analyze in more detail the subradiant character of an initially prepared single excitation in the atomic chain of periodicity $ka = \pi/2$. The decay properties are determined by the effective waveguide Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_{\text{wg}} = -i(\Gamma_{\text{1D}}/2) \sum_{m,n} e^{i(ka)|n-m|} \sigma_{eg}^m \sigma_{ge}^n$. For a single-excitation eigenstate $|i\rangle$ of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{wg}}$, the decay rate into the waveguide can be obtained by $\Gamma_{\text{dec}}^{(\text{1D})} = -2\text{Im}\langle i|\mathcal{H}_{\text{wg}}|i\rangle$. For arbitrary states that formula leads to the instantaneous decay rate at the initial time. These rates hold true for an excitation in $|e\rangle$; for the analogous states in $|s\rangle$ in the presence of a control field, they have to be replaced by $\Gamma_{\text{dec}}^{(\text{1D})} \rightarrow (\Omega/\delta_c)^2 \Gamma_{\text{dec}}^{(\text{1D})}$ as explained in the main text and in Appendix A.




FIG. 6. (a) Waveguide decay rate of the (basis of) single excitation eigenstates of $\text{Re}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{wg}})$ for a total atom number $N = 100$. The upper figure shows the waveguide decay rate $\Gamma_i^{(\text{1D})}$ of the first 20 eigenstates i , ordered by decreasing decay rate into the waveguide. The lower figure depicts a histogram of the decay rate distribution in the eigenbasis. Red vertical lines separate sub- from superradiant states. (b) ‘Dark state’ amplitude (upper) and phase (lower) for an atom number $N = 100$ and the two (‘degenerate’) configurations of minimal waveguide decay (blue circles and red stars). (c) Scaling of the waveguide decay rate $\Gamma_{\text{dec}}^{(\text{1D})}$ with the total atom number N for the ‘dark state’ (upper) and for a single excited atom (lower, excitation of the central atom at $N/2$). For the dark eigenstate $|\psi_d\rangle$ the rate is obtained analytically as $\Gamma_{\text{dec}}^{(\text{1D})} = -2\text{Im}(\langle\psi_d|\mathcal{H}_{\text{wg}}|\psi_d\rangle)$, whereas for the single excitation it is obtained out of the numerical $1/e$ population decay time in the absence of decay into free space ($\Gamma' = 0$).

Fig. 6(a) shows how the single excitation eigenstate manifold splits into a few states with decay rates larger than the single-atom rate, $\Gamma_{\text{dec}}^{(\text{1D})} > \Gamma_{\text{1D}}$ (superradiant), and many states with $\Gamma_{\text{dec}}^{(\text{1D})} < \Gamma_{\text{1D}}$ (subradiant). To obtain a complete orthogonal basis, we have defined the eigenbasis as the single excitation eigenstates of the Hermitian Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_{\text{wg}}^{\mathcal{R}} = \text{Re}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{wg}})$. It can be shown that the fraction of subradiant states to the total number of states increases with the total number of atoms N . Thus, an arbitrary state - unless specifically prepared in the superradiant manifold - is most likely of subradiant character.

We investigate further the properties of collective states whose rate of decay $\Gamma_{\text{dec}}^{(\text{1D})}$ into the waveguide is minimized, which we refer to as ‘dark states’. They can be written in the form $|\psi_d\rangle = \sum_n |c_n| e^{i\phi_n} |e\rangle_n$, where $|e\rangle_n$ denotes the state with atom n excited to $|e\rangle$ and all other atoms in the ground state. Two such states of minimal decay exist, which differ by their phase relation ($\phi_n = k_s a n$), i.e. are characterized by $k_s a = 0$ and $k_s a = \pi$, respectively. The amplitude and phase of these states are exemplified for an atom number $N = 100$ in Fig. 6(b).

The scaling of the waveguide decay rate $\Gamma_{\text{dec}}^{(\text{1D})}$ with the atom number N is shown in Fig. 6(c) for both the ‘dark

state' and a state in which just the central atom in the chain ($n = N/2$) is excited. Whereas the former scales as $1/N^3$, the latter scales as $1/N$. Both clearly are of subradiant character, and become more dark for an increasing atom number.

Appendix C: Reflectance spectra and transfer matrix model

In the main text (see Fig. 3(b) therein) we have illustrated the reflectance and transmittance spectra, both in the presence and absence of a 'gate' excitation in the system. It has been shown that the spectra obtained by a fully numerical simulation can be well-approximated by a linear optical transfer-matrix model. We here (Appendix C 1) outline in detail how that transfer-matrix model calculation is performed. Moreover, we confirm in Appendix C 2 the validity of the predictions obtained by the reflectance spectra calculations when there is a 'gate excitation' present, originally assumed to be non-decaying, for the cases when that latter condition does not hold true.

1. Transfer matrix model for the reflectance and transmittance spectra




FIG. 7. (a) Transfer matrix description for the field calculation. The input and output fields $\mathcal{E}$ are connected by a series of matrices $\mathcal{M}$ representing the scattering at an atomic site $\mathcal{M}_{\text{scatt}}$ and free propagation sections $\mathcal{M}_{\text{free}}$ in-between. (b) In the presence of a 'gate' excitation, the scattering at a single atomic site is modeled by an atom coupled to a non-dissipative ancilla via the atom-atom interaction $\pm \mathcal{J}$. The atomic steady state coherence $\langle \sigma_{ge} \rangle = \langle \sigma_{ge}^{\text{atom}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\text{ancilla}} \rangle$ determines the reflection coefficient r at the atomic site. (c) Reflectance (red squares) in the presence of an initial excitation, and transmittance (green triangles) in the absence of an initial excitation for the s - (upper) and e -branch (lower). The transfer matrix model predictions are given by the solid orange and green line, respectively. Parameters: $N = 100$, $\delta_c = 470 \Gamma'$, $\Omega = 94 \Gamma'$, $\mathcal{J} = 235 \Gamma'$.

For the propagation of photons in one dimension, a very elegant way to obtain linear reflectance and transmittance spectra is given by the transfer matrix approach[28, 36]. In that model, the propagation of photons is modeled by free propagation sections intersected by a series of scattering events at the (assumed point-like) atomic positions (see Fig. 7(a)). The input and output fields are then related by two-dimensional matrices $\mathcal{M}$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{E}_+^r \\ \mathcal{E}_-^r \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{M}_{\text{tot}} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{E}_+^l \\ \mathcal{E}_-^l \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with } \mathcal{M}_{\text{tot}} = \mathcal{M}_{\text{scatt}}^{(N)} \mathcal{M}_{\text{free}} \mathcal{M}_{\text{scatt}}^{(N-1)} \dots \mathcal{M}_{\text{scatt}}^{(1)} \mathcal{M}_{\text{free}} \quad (\text{C1})$$

where $+$ and $-$ denote the right ('transmitted') and left ('reflected') propagating field and l and r denote the left input (beginning of atom chain) and right output (chain end) position. The scattering matrices for atoms 1 to N are of the form

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{scatt}} = \frac{1}{t} \begin{pmatrix} t^2 - r^2 & r \\ -r & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{C2})$$

with t and r being the frequency-dependent reflection and transmission coefficients associated with a single atom. The free propagation imprints a pure phase and is described by

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{free}} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{ika} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-ika} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{C3})$$

In principle M_{free} is also frequency-dependent, through the frequency dependence of the wavevector k . However, for atomic systems, this dependence is negligible for realistic atom numbers [28], and we can evaluate ka at the atomic resonance frequency. For our system under consideration, we thus have $ka = \pi/2$ or $ka = (\pi/2)(1 + \kappa)$ with a small adjustment $\kappa \ll 1$ (see Appendix D 1). The total reflected and transmitted field coefficients then follow as $r_{\text{tot}} = \mathcal{M}_{\text{tot}}^{12}/\mathcal{M}_{\text{tot}}^{22}$ and $t_{\text{tot}} = 1/\mathcal{M}_{\text{tot}}^{22}$, respectively, with the numerical indices referring to the matrix elements of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{tot}}$. The reflectance (transmittance), defined as the ratio of reflected (transmitted) to input field intensity is then given by $\mathcal{R} = |r_{\text{tot}}|^2$ ($\mathcal{T} = |t_{\text{tot}}|^2$).

Thus it remains to calculate the transmission and reflection coefficients t and r . They can be obtained by solving for the steady state of the spin-model Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$ for a single atom. Based on the input-output relations [28, 31] (see also main text) $\mathcal{E}_+ = \mathcal{E}_0 + i \frac{\Gamma_{1D}}{2} \sigma_{ge}$ and $\mathcal{E}_- = i \frac{\Gamma_{1D}}{2} \sigma_{ge}$ and noting that $\mathcal{E}_+ = t \mathcal{E}_0$, $\mathcal{E}_- = r \mathcal{E}_0$ with the input field $\mathcal{E}_0$, the coefficients follow as

$$r = i \frac{\Gamma_{1D}}{2} \frac{1}{\mathcal{E}_0} \langle \sigma_{ge} \rangle^{[1st]}, \quad t = 1 + r. \quad (\text{C4})$$

Here $\langle \sigma_{ge} \rangle^{[1st]}$ denotes the steady state expectation value to first (linear) order in $\mathcal{E}_0$.

In the *absence of an initial 'gate' excitation* the atomic scattering matrices are equal, i.e. $\mathcal{M}_{\text{scatt}}^{(k)} \equiv \mathcal{M}_{\text{scatt}}$. The transmission and reflection coefficients follow out of

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{atom}} = - \left(\delta + i \frac{\Gamma' + \Gamma_{1D}}{2} \right) \sigma_{ee} - (\delta - \delta_c) \sigma_{ss} - \Omega (\sigma_{es} + \text{h.c.}) - \mathcal{E}_0 (\sigma_{eg} + \text{h.c.}) \quad (\text{C5})$$

and (C4), and for the three-level atom are given by the known coefficients [37]

$$r = - \frac{\Gamma_{1D} (\delta - \delta_c)}{(\Gamma_{1D} + \Gamma' - i2\delta) (\delta - \delta_c) + i2\Omega^2} \quad \text{and} \quad t = 1 + r. \quad (\text{C6})$$

A priori, the case where a *'gate' excitation is present* seems beyond what can be captured by the transfer matrix approach for linear optics, since formally the response to a subsequent signal photon involves the atomic two-excitation manifold (see Appendix A, for example). However, we can construct a simpler artificial model (see Fig. 7 (b)), in which the 'gate' excitation is held in an ancilla atom that is decoupled from the waveguide – thus it does not decay nor do photons in the waveguide directly excite this ancilla. In this model, the ancilla atom interacts via a photonic band gap, i.e. via the alternating atom-atom coupling $\pm \mathcal{J}$, to an 'actual' atom that does couple to the waveguide. We can therefore calculate the linear optical properties of the actual atom, which is modified by the ancilla, and we find that our artificial model captures well the dynamics of the full system of interest. In that case, $\mathcal{M}_{\text{scatt}}^{(2k)} = \mathcal{M}_{\text{scatt}}^{[-\mathcal{J}]}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{scatt}}^{(2k+1)} = \mathcal{M}_{\text{scatt}}^{[+\mathcal{J}]}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $\pm \mathcal{J}$ referring to the sign of the alternating atom-atom coupling constant. The Hamiltonian is described by $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{atom}} + \mathcal{H}_{\text{ancilla}} + \mathcal{H}_{\text{int}}$, denoting the system, two-level ancilla and interaction Hamiltonian, respectively. The atom (system) part $\mathcal{H}_{\text{atom}}$ is given by (C5), the ancilla Hamiltonian takes the form

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{ancilla}} = -\delta \sigma_{ee}^{(2)} - (\delta - \delta_c) \sigma_{ss}^{(2)} - \Omega (\sigma_{es}^{(2)} + \text{h.c.}) \quad (\text{C7})$$

and the atom-atom interaction between both follow as $\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} = \pm \mathcal{J} \sigma_{es}^{(1)} \otimes \sigma_{se}^{(2)} + \text{h.c.}$. Here the indices (1) and (2) denote the atom and ancilla, respectively. The reflection and transmission coefficients are obtained out of (C4), by

solving for the steady state expectation value $\langle \sigma_{ge} \rangle^{[1st]} = \langle \sigma_{ge}^{(1)} \otimes \mathbb{1}^{(2)} \rangle^{[1st]}$ to first (linear) order in $\mathcal{E}_0$. Thereby the initial excitation (in e or s) is set by setting the populations in the coupled (optical Bloch) equations to the values

$$\begin{aligned} \langle |g\rangle_1 \langle g| \otimes |e\rangle_2 \langle e| \rangle &= 1 \quad (\text{e-branch}) \\ \langle |g\rangle_1 \langle g| \otimes |s\rangle_2 \langle s| \rangle &= 1 \quad (\text{s-branch}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C8})$$

and all remaining populations to zero. Setting the populations to numerical values in the equations explicitly assumes them to be constant to a good approximation. This limits the validity of the formula to $(\Omega/\delta_c)^2 \ll 1$, i.e. to a regime in which the bare states $|e\rangle$ and $|s\rangle$ form a good basis of the coupled system. Moreover the population exchange between system and ancilla must be negligible, that is the approach is not valid for a signal field excitation to state s with an initial (ancilla) ‘gate’ e -excitation and vice versa.

In Fig. 7(c) the transfer matrix model predictions for the reflectance and transmittance spectra (solid lines) are compared to the results of a full numerical simulation (data points) of the spin-model Hamiltonian. The latter is obtained by numerically solving for the steady state reflectance and transmittance for a cw-input field (see also the upcoming Appendix E), where the initial state is set to all atoms being in the ground state (no initial ‘gate’ excitation) or to an excitation of a single atom to $|e\rangle$ or $|s\rangle$ whose decay rates Γ' , Γ_{1D} are set to zero (initial ‘gate’ excitation). Good agreement of the approaches is obtained, even when the parameters are not chosen to reside deep in the dispersive regime, e.g. $\Omega/\delta_c \simeq 0.2$, $\mathcal{J}/\delta_c \simeq 0.5$.

2. Resonances for a decaying excitation




FIG. 8. (a) s -branch reflectance spectrum for an initial and non-decaying s -excitation in an ancilla atom, the latter decoupled from the waveguide. Data points are obtained by scanning the detuning of a weak-coherent cw-probe field and by recording the steady state reflectance. Solid lines illustrate the transfer matrix prediction. (b) Pulse reflectance for a $\sin^2$ -shaped input pulse centered at δ (data points) and reflectance spectra as obtained from (a) (solid lines) for the right (red) and left (blue) resonance. The initial and decaying ‘gate’ excitation in the pulse setup is prepared in a ‘dark state’ (cf. Appendix B). The pulse width t_0 has been optimized to maximize reflectance on resonance, moreover reflectance dips originating from interactions with the off-resonant atomic sublattice have been compensated for by adjusting the propagation phase (see Appendix D 1) with adjustment parameter κ . For these plots, the optimized parameters are $t_0 = 2.95$, $\kappa = 9e-4$ for the right and $t_0 = 7.82$, $\kappa = -1.4e-4$ for the left resonance. Parameters: $N = 100$, $\Gamma_{1D} = \Gamma' = 1$, $\delta_c = 470$, $\Omega = 94$, $\mathcal{J} = 235$, $\mathcal{E}_0 = 1e-4$. The resonance positions δ_{res} and widths $\Delta\omega_{\text{res}}$ (1/2 decay) are given by $\delta_{\text{res}} = 514.9$, $\Delta\omega_{\text{res}} = 4.5$ (right resonance) and $\delta_{\text{res}} = 476.73$, $\Delta\omega_{\text{res}} = 0.82$ (left resonance).

The spectra obtained e.g. in Fig. 7(c) are meant to represent an idealized case where the signal field responds to an atomic medium where an initial ‘gate’ excitation is first created, and which never decays. This model thus relies on introducing an artificial ‘ancilla’ atom, which permanently carries this excitation but is decoupled from the waveguide. To confirm the validity of the predictions, we now consider a system where all of the atoms are coupled to the waveguide, and the system is initialized such that a single and decaying excitation in $|s\rangle$ is prepared in a ‘dark state’ superposition, i.e. in the state $|\psi_d\rangle$ as defined in Appendix B but with $|e\rangle$ replaced by $|s\rangle$. Fig. 8(a) shows the resulting predicted reflectance spectrum for a weak cw signal field, as generated from our (non-decaying) ancilla model. This model predicts two reflectance peaks with distinct linewidths $\Delta\omega_{\text{res}}$ and central frequencies δ_{res} . To probe the system where a single (waveguide-coupled) excitation in s is prepared in a dark state at $t = 0$, we apply a weak coherent state pulse $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\text{in}}(t) = \mathcal{E}_0 \sin^2(\pi t/(2t_0))$ ($0 \leq t \leq 2t_0$) and scan its central frequency δ . The corresponding pulse reflectance, defined as the integrated reflected intensity divided by that of the incident field, is numerically

maximized over pulse durations t_0 , and the results are plotted in Fig. 8(b). The detunings that maximize reflectance coincide with the ones predicted by the ancilla model, moreover the linewidths agree well in both approaches. Thus, the ancilla-based model correctly captures the essential spectral properties relevant for the actual pulse reflectance in the fully waveguide-coupled setup.

Appendix D: Corrections to the ideal Lorentzian reflectance shape

1. Cross-interference reflectance dips and their compensation

In the main text, it was discussed that an atomic lattice with lattice constant $ka = \pi$ ideally produces a Lorentzian reflectance spectrum (Eq. (3) of main text). Then in the case of band-gap interactions, we argued that an array of atoms with lattice constant $ka = \pi/2$ effectively appears as two sub-lattices each of lattice constant $ka = \pi$ for a signal field, when a ‘gate’ excitation is first stored. For low atom number, the reflectance near the resonance of one sub-lattice fits well with a Lorentzian. For larger atom number, however, the off-resonant response of the other sublattice cannot be ignored, and results in a significant interference dip in the reflectance (see inset of Fig. 3(b) in the main text). Here we analyze the origin of the reflectance dip, and discuss how it can be eliminated by a slight change in the inter-atomic propagation phase, $ka = (\pi/2)(1 + \kappa)$. We employ the transfer matrix formalism described in Appendix C.

A repetitive unit in the transfer matrix description consists of a scattering event at the (quasi-) resonant atom $\mathcal{M}_{\text{scatt}}$ (C2), followed by a free propagation $\mathcal{M}_{\text{free}}$ (C3) of distance a , an off-resonant scattering $\mathcal{M}_{\text{scatt}}^{\text{off}}$ (at the off-resonant sublattice), and another free propagation section $\mathcal{M}_{\text{free}}$. For weak probe fields and large detunings, the individual off-resonant e - and s -transitions contribute independently and the scattering matrix can be written as $\mathcal{M}_{\text{scatt}}^{\text{off}} \simeq \mathcal{M}_{\text{scatt}}^e \mathcal{M}_{\text{scatt}}^s$ with $\mathcal{M}_{\text{scatt}}^\mu$ the two-level scattering matrix of transition μ . The two-level reflection and transmission coefficients are given by Eq. (C6) with $\Omega = \delta_c = 0$, $\Gamma_{1D} \rightarrow \Gamma_{1D}^\mu$, $\Gamma' \rightarrow \Gamma'_\mu$ and $\delta \simeq \Delta_\mu$. Here Γ_{1D}^μ and Γ'_μ correspond to the effective decay rates of transition μ . The detuning Δ_μ denotes the field detuning to the off-resonant sub-lattice resonance μ . As we assume the probe field to be tuned to a particular reflectance resonance, whose reflectance dip behavior we seek to analyze, Δ_μ simply corresponds to the reflectance peak separation. Out of (C2) and for large detunings Δ_μ , that is, to first order in $(\Gamma' + \Gamma_{1D})/\Delta_\mu$, this results in

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{scatt}}^\mu \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 - i\kappa_\mu \frac{\pi}{2} & -i\kappa_\mu \frac{\pi}{2} \\ i\kappa_\mu \frac{\pi}{2} & 1 + i\kappa_\mu \frac{\pi}{2} \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{D1})$$

where we defined $\Gamma_{1D}^\mu/(2\Delta_\mu) = \kappa_\mu \pi/2$.

The idea is to compensate for the disturbance introduced by $\mathcal{M}_{\text{scatt}}^\mu$ through adjusting the free space propagation phase as $ka = \pi(1 + \kappa)/2$. Introducing that phase into the free propagation matrix $\mathcal{M}_{\text{free}}$ (C3) results in

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{free}} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}}(1 + i\kappa \frac{\pi}{2}) & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\frac{\pi}{2}}(1 - i\kappa \frac{\pi}{2}) \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{D2})$$

where for consistency the adjustment parameter has been expanded to first order.

A single repetitive unit thus follows as $\mathcal{M}_{\text{unit}} = \mathcal{M}_{\text{free}} \mathcal{M}_{\text{scatt}}^{\text{off}} \mathcal{M}_{\text{free}} \mathcal{M}_{\text{scatt}}$. Note that if one removes the contribution of the off-resonant sub-lattice (which can be achieved by setting $\kappa_\mu = 0$ in $\mathcal{M}_{\text{scatt}}^{\text{off}}$), and if one also sets $\kappa = 0$, then $\mathcal{M}_{\text{unit}}$ describes a unit cell of the ideal atomic mirror configuration. This yields the Lorentzian reflectance (Eq. (3) in main text). To recover the ideal situation, our goal is then to choose κ such that it cancels the presence of κ_μ to lowest order. It can readily be shown that

$$\kappa = \kappa_e + \kappa_s \quad \text{with} \quad \kappa_\mu = \frac{\Gamma_{1D}^\mu}{\pi \Delta_\mu}. \quad (\text{D3})$$

That is, both the off-resonant sublattice e - and s -transition can contribute to the formation of reflectance dips. Besides the adjustment of the inter-atomic propagation phase by κ , reducing its magnitude e.g. by increasing the detunings Δ_μ can be utilized to suppress the dip formation. As shown in Fig. 4(a) in the main text, an adjustment of the inter-atomic phase by κ , which eliminates the dips in the reflectance resonances, prevents the reflectance of a probe pulse from saturating with an increasing optical depth.

2. Overlapping resonances for small sublattice separations

For well-separated sublattice resonances $\Delta\nu > (N/2)\Gamma_{1D}^{\text{eff}}$, we have seen that the reflectance around resonance is characterized by a Lorentzian form

$$\mathcal{R}(\Gamma_{1D}^{\text{eff}}, \Gamma'_{\text{eff}}, \delta') = \frac{[(N/2)\Gamma_{1D}^{\text{eff}}]^2}{[(N/2)\Gamma_{1D}^{\text{eff}} + \Gamma'_{\text{eff}}]^2 + (2\delta')^2} \quad (\text{D4})$$

with Γ_{1D}^{eff} , Γ'_{eff} the effective decay rates of the corresponding transition and δ' the detuning from resonance. This formula is exact in the case that the response from one sub-lattice is completely ignored, and the probe field thus only ‘sees’ a single sub-lattice with double periodicity $k(2a) = \pi$ [28]. In the main text we focus on the limit, in which (D4) is approximately fulfilled, though even in that case modifications due to the presence of the off-resonant atomic sublattice can be crucial as discussed in Appendix D 1.

We here outline the dependence of the reflectance properties on the sublattice frequency splitting $\Delta\nu$, with a special focus on the regime of overlapping sublattice resonances. Despite the possibility of achieving large spin interaction strengths on the order of $\mathcal{J} \sim \text{GHz}$ in photonic crystal waveguides [21], $\Delta\nu$ cannot be made arbitrarily large. In particular for the *e*-branch, the creation of well-separated resonances is more challenging than for the *s*-branch resonance (see e.g. Fig. 7 (c)). This is due to the fact that while $\Delta\nu$ is equal for both the *e*- and *s*-branch, the effective waveguide and free space decay rates (see Appendix A), and thus the resonance linewidths are much larger for the *e*-branch.




FIG. 9. (a) Reflectance $\mathcal{R}$ vs. detuning δ for an alternating modulation of the atomic transition frequency by $\pm\Delta\nu/2$. The atomic resonances are given by $\delta = \pm\Delta\nu/2$ for the corresponding sublattices. (b) Reflectance spectrum (red solid) for a transition frequency alternation $\Delta\nu/2 = \pm 5\Gamma'$ (upper) and $\Delta\nu/2 = \pm 15\Gamma'$ (lower). Blue dashed lines correspond to the resonances for the single sublattices of double periodicity. (c) Maximal reflectance amplitude vs. detuning alternation $\pm\Delta\nu/2$ (resonance splitting $\Delta\nu$). Blue dashed lines correspond to the maximal reflectance of a single sublattice. Inset: Corresponding detuning for maximal reflectance.

Parameters: $N\Gamma_{1D} = 20\Gamma'$, $ka = \pi/2$. The simulations have been performed within the transfer matrix formalism.

In Fig. 9 we analyze some general properties associated with overlapping sublattice resonances. Thereby we use a simple model of a two-level system of coupling rates Γ' , Γ_{1D} and lattice period $ka = \pi/2$ with a symmetric alternation of the atomic resonance frequency by $\pm\Delta\nu/2$. Fig. 9 (a) illustrates the reflectance $\mathcal{R}$ of a probe field vs. resonance splitting $\Delta\nu$ and probe field detuning δ . Here $\delta = 0$ corresponds to the resonance with the atomic transition for $\Delta\nu = 0$. As can be seen, for very small sublattice (resonance) splittings ($\Delta\nu \lesssim \Gamma'$, regime (i)), the reflectance is close to zero. This corresponds to a regime, in which the individual sublattices are not resolved. Further increasing $\Delta\nu$ leads to strong reflectance. In the regime $\Gamma' < \Delta\nu < N\Gamma_{1D}/2$ (regime (ii)), i.e. when the splitting is smaller than the reflectance linewidth given by (D4), overlap effects of the individual sublattice reflectances are expected. The figure reveals that the maximal reflectance is located within $|\delta| < \Delta\nu/2$ in that case. In contrast, for $\Delta\nu > (N/2)\Gamma_{1D}$ (regime (iii)), the branches (i.e. detunings of maximal reflectance) coincide with the atomic sub-lattice resonances $\delta = \pm\Delta\nu/2$ to a good approximation. This behavior is further confirmed in Fig. 9 (b), where the reflectance (red line) is shown for two different splittings in the regimes (ii) (upper figure) and (iii) (lower figure). For comparison, we also plot Eq. (D4) (blue dashed curves), which illustrates the Lorentzian that one would expect for a single sublattice with the other one ignored. Thus regime (ii) can be clearly identified as the one, in which the single sublattice resonances overlap and

the maximal reflectance amplitude is given for detunings δ in-between the atomic resonances, whereas regime (iii) is close to the regime of two independent sublattice reflectances (D4) centered around the atomic resonances. Note also that both sublattices contribute constructively for $|\delta| < \Delta\nu/2$, i.e. the reflectance for these detunings is larger than the one of a single sublattice (blue dashed). Fig. 9 (c) depicts the maximal reflectance amplitude (red curve) and its dependence on the sublattice splitting $\Delta\nu$, compared to the maximal reflectance amplitude of a single sublattice alone (D4) (blue, dashed). As can be seen, the maximal amplitude increases with the splitting, approaching the single sublattice reflectance for $\Delta\nu \gg (N/2)\Gamma_{1D}$. Thus, well-resolved sublattices maximize the peak reflectance. The inset shows for which detunings these maximal reflectance peak values are reached, again confirming that for large $\Delta\nu$ (regime (iii)) this corresponds to the atomic resonances (indicated by the blue dashed line) whereas in regime (ii) detunings in-between the atomic sub-lattice resonances turn out to be optimal.

Appendix E: Numerical reflectance and transmittance calculation

We here illustrate the procedure used for numerically calculating the reflectance and transmittance of a probe field $\mathcal{E}_{\text{in}}(z, t)$. It is based on the spin-model description [31], i.e. a time evolution of the atomic (spin) state $|\psi\rangle$ under an effective non-Hermitian Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$, and the subsequent reconstruction of the field based on input-output relations (see main text for the effective spin Hamiltonian and the general form of the input-output operators). In order to reduce the numerical complexity, we truncate the atomic wavefunction $|\psi\rangle$ to a maximum of two excitations in e or s , i.e. we keep only the ground state $|g_0\rangle = |g\rangle^{\otimes N}$ with all atoms in g , the single-excitation states $\{|e_m\rangle, |s_m\rangle\}$ with one atom (e.g. atom m) excited, and the two-excitation states $\{|e_m e_n\rangle, |s_m s_n\rangle, |e_m s_n\rangle\}$ with two excited atoms (e.g. m and n). For that approximation to be valid, i.e. for higher order excitations to be negligible, we restrict the probe field $\mathcal{E}_{\text{in}}(z, t)$ to weak coherent fields of photon number $\bar{n} \ll 1$. The wavefunction is initialized in the ground state $|\psi(0)\rangle = |g_0\rangle$ or in a single ‘gate’ excitation state $|\psi(0)\rangle = |s'\rangle$ (s -branch) or $|\psi(0)\rangle = |e'\rangle$ (e -branch). These latter states can be superpositions of single excitation states, e.g. the ‘dark state’ configuration introduced in Appendix B, or non-decaying ancilla states as used for the reflectance spectra calculations. Subsequently the time evolved atomic state $|\psi(t)\rangle$ is numerically calculated based on the Schrödinger equation $(d/dt)|\psi(t)\rangle = -i\mathcal{H}|\psi(t)\rangle$.

The reflected I_r and transmitted I_t field intensities at a specific time t and position z then follow from the input-output relations. For example, the transmitted field $\mathcal{E}_+(z_e, t) = \mathcal{E}_{\text{in}}(z, t) \mathbb{1} + i(\Gamma_{1D}/2) \sum_{m=1}^N \sigma_{ge}^m e^{ik(z_e - z_m)}$, where $z_e = Na$ denotes the end position of the atomic chain. Thus, the transmitted intensity follows as

$$I_t(z_e, t) = \langle \psi(t) | \mathcal{E}_+(z_e, t)^\dagger \mathcal{E}_+(z_e, t) | \psi(t) \rangle \quad (\text{E1})$$

and involves the calculation of two-body atomic correlations of the form $\langle \psi(t) | \sigma_{eg}^m \sigma_{ge}^n | \psi(t) \rangle$. The reflected field intensity follows analogously by simply replacing the field operators with the ones of inverse propagation $\mathcal{E}_-(z = 0, t) = i(\Gamma_{1D}/2) \sum_{m=1}^N \sigma_{ge}^m e^{ikz_m}$. The transmittance $\mathcal{T}$ then follows by normalizing the transmitted intensity by the input intensity. For a cw input field $\mathcal{E}_{\text{in}}(z, t) = \mathcal{E}_0 e^{i(kz - \delta t)}$, e.g. for the calculation of the transmittance spectra, this is performed by evaluating (E1) in the steady state regime (i.e. at a time when I_t reaches a constant value I_t^{ss} in time), and the transmittance then follows as $\mathcal{T} = I_t^{\text{ss}}/|\mathcal{E}_0|^2$. For a signal pulse, e.g. $\mathcal{E}_{\text{in}}(z, t) = \mathcal{E}_0 \sin^2(\pi t/(2t_0)) e^{i(kz - \delta t)}$, it is defined by $\mathcal{T} = (\int I_t(z_e, t') dt') / (\int |\mathcal{E}_{\text{in}}(t')|^2 dt')$, where in addition the background field of the dissipative ‘gate excitation’ is subtracted as discussed below. The reflectances $\mathcal{R}$ and higher order correlations as $g^{(2)}(0)$ are calculated analogously.

As the time evolution follows from the Schrödinger equation in the wavefunction picture, the dissipative nature, i.e. the emission into free space (Γ') and into the waveguide (Γ_{1D}), is only accounted for by the norm decay of the wavefunction evolving under the non-Hermitian Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$. In particular, quantum jumps, e.g. a jump from $|e\rangle$ to $|g\rangle$ by the emission of a photon, are not correctly accounted for. Thus, either the occurrence of these jumps must be small, which implies that the wavefunction norm decay on the timescale of interest is small, or the state after a jump event (e.g. $|g\rangle$) must have a negligible impact on the observables of interest $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{T}$.

For a weak coherent field input and in the absence of a ‘gate’ excitation, the total excited state population $\wp_{\text{ex}}$ remains small and the occurrence of quantum jumps (e.g. with rate $\sim \wp_{\text{ex}} \Gamma'$) can be neglected on the considered timescale (e.g. the time to reach a steady state that forms on a timescale $\sim \Gamma'^{-1}$). The case of an initial ‘gate’ excitation is more subtle as it involves a full excitation, whose decay is generally non-negligible. In our specific case, where our observable of interest is reflection of a signal field, including jumps would yield a negligible change. In particular, a jump to $|g_0\rangle$ causes the system to be almost perfectly transmitting. This originates from the fact that the resulting state following the jump corresponds to a configuration far-detuned from the probe field, which is assumed to be tuned to the two-excitation reflectance resonance. Therefore the field then does not interact with the atomic lattice any more and thus does not contribute to the reflectance signal. The decay of reflectance associated with the gate excitation decay is correctly accounted for by the wavefunction norm decay and does not require to consider jump events.

Despite the ‘gate’ excitation being of subradiant nature (‘dark’) with respect to the waveguide emission, the field associated with its decay, named ‘background field’ in the following, can still be significant compared to the field of a weak-coherent ‘signal’ pulse. In contrast, for a true single photon pulse for the signal, we must subtract out the part of the intensity that arises from leakage of the gate into the waveguide. The background subtracted pulse reflectance can be obtained in the following way: Calculating the output field intensity in the absence of a ‘signal’ pulse, i.e. for $\mathcal{E}_{\text{in}} \equiv 0$ and an initial gate excitation e.g. $|\psi(0)\rangle = |s'\rangle$, and subtracting that intensity from the combined intensity in its presence ($\mathcal{E}_{\text{in}} \neq 0$, $|\psi(0)\rangle = |s'\rangle$). The method has been found successful in recovering the expected pulse shapes and scalings even for background fields that are orders of magnitude larger than the reflected ‘signal’ field. As an example, we illustrate in Fig. 10 the reflected and transmitted intensity of a ‘signal’ pulse in the presence of a decaying ‘gate’ excitation in s . In Fig. 10 (a) the total combined intensity of signal pulse field and the field leaked by the gate excitation is shown. The signal pulse shape can be identified on top of a fast-oscillating background, where the oscillations are due to the non-eigenstate nature of the initial excitation. The background subtracted intensities are depicted in Fig. 10 (b) along with the background field alone. A clear separation of these individual components is obtained; both the oscillating nature is removed for the background subtracted pulse intensities and a proper normalization is observed, i.e. the intensity is (approaches) zero at the beginning and end of the signal pulse.




FIG. 10. Reflected I_r (red) and transmitted I_t (blue) signal pulse intensity in time for a signal pulse $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{\text{in}}(t) = \mathcal{E}_0 \sin^2(\pi t/(2t_0))$ [$0 \leq t \leq 2t_0$] centered around the broader s -resonance of Fig. 7 (c) and for an initial ‘gate’ excitation in s prepared at $t = 0$. The intensities are normalized by $|\mathcal{E}_0|^2$. (a) Including the background field leaked by the initial excitation. (b) With subtracted background field as explained in the main text. Gray lines represent the background field intensity alone. *Parameters:* $N = 200$, $\Gamma_{1D} = 0.5\Gamma'$, $\delta_c = 470\Gamma'$, $\Omega = 94\Gamma'$, $\mathcal{J} = 235\Gamma'$, $\delta = 514.9\Gamma'$, $t_0 = 2.95\Gamma'^{-1}$, $\mathcal{E}_0 = 2\text{e-}4$ and $\kappa = 8\text{e-}4$.